

I will continue to do my utmost to see that their views are heard and accounted for. I am confident that with this bill's passage our communities and this important American institution may begin a new era of cooperation for the good of all involved. And we can put the community back in the Postal Service.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will join Senator JEFFORDS and me in passing this important legislation.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a bill that my colleague Senator BAUCUS and I are reintroducing titled the "Post Office Community Partnership Act of 1999".

Aside from a few technical changes, the bill is similar to the one we introduced in the 105th Congress that was supported by so many of our colleagues in a 76-21 vote last July. Unfortunately our postal language was dropped from the underlying bill during conference with the House. However, I am hopeful that this year our bill will become law. I should add that this year we have coordinated our efforts with Representative BLUMENAUER of Oregon and an identical companion bill is being put forward in both the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, I live in a small town in Vermont. I understand the importance downtowns and village centers play in the identity and longevity of communities. Downtowns are the social and economic hearts of small communities. They are where neighbors catch up on the news, shop, worship, and celebrate national holidays.

Our bill will enable the residents of small villages and large towns to have a say when the Postal Service decides that their local post office will be closed, relocated, or consolidated. Local post offices are important tenants in any vibrant downtown. A recent article in USA Today cited a 1993 study that found that 80 percent of the people who shopped downtown planned their visit around a visit to the post office.

There is much talk in the news today about revitalizing our downtowns and encouraging smart growth. I say to my colleagues, if you want to encourage smart growth, let's start by doing what we can do to keep federal facilities such as post offices in downtowns.

Some of my colleagues may ask why this legislation is necessary. A story from my home state of Vermont will answer that question.

A few years ago the general store on the green in Perkinsville, Vermont went bankrupt and the adjacent post office wanted to leave the small village center for a new building outside of town. By the time the community was aware of the relocation, plans were so far along—the new building had actually been constructed based on the promise of the post office as the anchor tenant—that there was no time to fully investigate in-town alternatives. One elderly resident wrote that in contrast to families now being able to walk to

the post office, "we certainly won't be walking along the busy Route 106 two miles or more to get postal services."

Mr. President, post office closings and relocations are occurring all across the country and especially in small and rural communities. My colleagues will quickly discover similar examples in their own states where the removal of the post office has harmed the economic vitality of the downtown area, deprived citizens without cars of access, and contributed to sprawl.

Mr. President, post offices in Vermont and across the nation are centers of social and business interaction. In communities where post offices are located on village greens or in downtowns, they become integral to these communities' identities. I believe that this legislation will strengthen the federal-local ties of the Postal Service, help preserve our downtowns, and combat the problem of sprawl. I urge my colleagues to join Senator BAUCUS and me in support of this important legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 13

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 13, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional tax incentives for education.

S. 493

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 493, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to evaluate, develop, and implement pilot projects in Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina to address problems associated with toxic microorganisms in tidal and non-tidal wetlands and waters.

S. 508

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 508, a bill to prohibit implementation of "Know Your Customer" regulations by the Federal banking agencies.

S. 528

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 528, a bill to provide for a private right of action in the case of injury from the importation of certain dumped and subsidized merchandise.

S. 543

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance.

AMENDMENT NO. 40

At the request of Mr. ALLARD the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), and the Sen-

ator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 40 proposed to S. 280, a bill to provide for education flexibility partnerships.

At the request of Mr. ROBB his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 40 proposed to S. 280, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. NICKLES his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 40 proposed to S. 280, *supra*.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION GUARANTY FEE SHOULD NOT BE INCREASED TO PROVIDE INCREASED REVENUES

Mr. GRAMS (for himself and Mr. GORTON) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

S. CON. RES. 16

Whereas the Government National Mortgage Association, known as Ginnie Mae, was established as a wholly owned corporation of the United States to facilitate the worldwide sale of investment securities backed by mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) or the Veterans Administration (VA), which is now the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Whereas Ginnie Mae assesses a fee to lenders issuing such securities and notes for the guaranty, by Ginnie Mae, of the timely payment to investors of principal and interest of the securities and notes;

Whereas the guaranty fee currently charged by Ginnie Mae, at a rate of 6 basis points, has produced significant net revenue for the Federal Government each year;

Whereas Ginnie Mae is actuarially sound and its reserves are sufficient to protect the taxpayers of the United States from any loss;

Whereas the cost of home ownership is increasing, thereby making the dream of home ownership unattainable for many families in the United States;

Whereas FHA and VA loans are used primarily by first-time and minority homeowners to achieve the dream of home ownership;

Whereas Congress should seek to eliminate barriers to affordable housing and reduce the costs of home ownership; and

Whereas proposals to increase the Ginnie Mae guaranty fee above the current rate, if enacted, would constitute a tax on home ownership, would increase the costs of owning a home, and would ultimately deny many Americans the opportunity to own a home; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that any increase in the guaranty fee assessed by the Government National Mortgage Association above the rate currently in effect constitutes an unnecessary and unwarranted tax on home ownership that cannot be justified as sound public policy or as necessary for financial soundness of the Government National Mortgage Association and, therefore, should not be used to provide increased revenues for the Federal Government to offset other expenditures.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, today I am submitting a Senate Concurrent